1/10/70

Dear Mon,

I am very happy to get your letter of the 7th, telling me Louis is now making the copies of the transcripts I'd asked for. I look forward to getting them and to being able to go over them. Gary and Paul will also go over them, in our interest and on the chance of spotting something that may be of interest to you. I regard this as quite possible, if not certain, for there is a rather large amount of miscellaneous information that may fit. Without persuing it there is no way of knowing.

That your prime interest is in evidence that you can use in the Shaw perjury trial is something we all understand. What I think you may not understand is that most of the things of which I have written you lately may be of this nature, and again, until it is correlated and check out, we do not know. For example, this was my reason for asking the name of the Cuban group to which Shaw provided space in the ITM. Alock questioned Josephine whatshername, Shaw's former secretary, about this, according to the papers. Now I may or may not have info that is relevant. When I know its name and/or the names of the people in it I can let you know, and will. This is my chief reason for wanting to go over Shaw's and Cobb's testimony. I have no other intrest in Cobb. We have obtained some documents referring to Ferrie that the Archives pretended not to have. What is in them is not in itself significant, but it may match with other information, of which the trial transcripts are one possibility. This is my interest in O'Sullivan. While I do not anticipate being able to prove it if it is true, and I have no way of knowing that it can be, I nonetheless regard information about any of the camps and any of the people connected with them as potentially of this nature. My own work, not by any means definitive or beyond question, shows Shaw and people connected with the camps, patronized the same places, for example. I do not for one minute believe Ricardo Davis's tale to me that he knew Shaw as pro-Castro, and I regard it as possible he was throwing me a curve. Or intended to. The fact is, I have suspicions (and no more than suspicions) that someone you trust may be a very good lead in this direction, of making the connection.

If there is any difference between us on this, it may be that you are looking to find them in bed together, or at least a picture of it, while I am looking for less direct connections, which I think may exist. Frankly, I am pleased that you are concentrating on the crux and not on peripheral matters. However, the rest of us still have interest in what in your case is peripheral or in some cases more remote. In these areas we are making progress.

Referring to O'Sullivan again, I believe I have never given you the quote fromiubie Badeaux' book (pp 25405):"Dayries assured me that I would not only get a man to assist me but that I could make my own selection of an assistant. I asked him to lend me the services of Officer Francis (sic) O'Sulliven, a young Patrolman whom I consider (sic) to be qualified to become an expert Intelligence Agent. Dayries indicated to me that O'Sullivan's transfer to my Division could be arranged...." Abadeaux selection (from <u>all</u> the New Orleans policeman available!) amounted to a Banister selection. You should recall the other things about O'S that I have reported and on which I have given brief memos. And it is in just this area, relating to Ferrie, that his testimony has been edited and the editing is <u>not</u> on the stenographic transcript sent to the printer.

Again, thanks, best to you all, and my the year be a good one.

Sincerely,